

## REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. Claims 5 and 17 were previously canceled. Hence, claims 1-4, 6-16 and 18-30 are pending in this application. The amendments to the claims do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, the amendments to the claims were made to improve the readability and clarity of the claims and not for any reason related to patentability. All issues raised in the Office Action mailed December 11, 2008 are addressed hereinafter.

### I. ISSUES RELATING TO ALLEGED PRIOR ART

#### A. CLAIMS — 35 U.S.C. § 102(e): INOUE

Claims 1, 6-11, 13, 18-23 and 27-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Inoue et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,277,942 (hereinafter “Inoue”). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

### CLAIM 1

Current claim 1 recites:

1. A method of providing access to services across a computer network, comprising the step of:  
generating an access request by a requesting network access device through which an end user device can obtain access to network resources, said access request comprising a requesting network access device description and a plurality of service requests indicative of computer services for which the requesting network access device requests provisioning;  
**wherein the requesting network access device description includes one or more of: a requesting network access device vendor, a requesting network access device type and a requesting network access device version; and**  
**forwarding said access request for authentication and authorization.**

Inoue does not anticipate at least “generating an access request by a requesting network access device, through which an end user device can obtain access to network resources, and which is forwarded for authentication and authorization, wherein the requesting network access device description includes one or more of: a requesting network access device vendor, a

requesting network access device type and a requesting network access device version,” recited in claim 1.

According to claim 1, a request sent from a network access device, comprises a description of the requested network resource, and also comprises a description of the physical characteristics of the requesting access device. Moreover, the request is forwarded for authentication and authorization. For example, if a user requests a movie, the user sends for authorization and authentication a request comprising a description of the requested movie and information about the vendor/type or version of the user’s current device. According to claim 1, the user can specify the requested movie, and also a physical description of the user’s device so the requested movie is provided in the format compatible with the device.

As described in paragraph [26] of applicants’ specification, for example, the approach of claim 1 “provides a way for the AAA server to choose among multiple services that are offered by a single network device,” and “authentication and authorization can be provided in a more granular manner (by service/user)” than provided otherwise. For example, when the user provides to the AAA user device’s type, vendor or version information, the AAA could search for a copy of the movie in the format compatible with the user device’s version. Without knowing the user device’s type, vendor or version information, the AAA would only search for the first available copy of the particular movie, paying no attention to whether the movie’s data format is compatible with the device.

**In Inoue, a user provides physical location information so the Internet Service Provider knows what type of information the user might be interested in, not based on requesting device type and version, as claimed.** Inoue’s user provides the ISP with the information about the user’s current physical location since Inoue’s user may contact the ISP from a wireless portable terminal or mobile phone. (Inoue: col. 2, ll. 39-43) Knowing the current physical location of the user allows providing the user with geographically relevant information, such as information about the stores or restaurants located in the vicinity of the user’s current location (Inoue: col. 2, ll. 45-47), or allows providing the information specific to a particular area in a big shopping mall while the user is moving in the mall (Inoue: col. 2, ll. 54-

55). Moreover, based on the information about the current physical location of the user, the service provider selects one or more cache servers located within the geographic range of the user and controls the cache servers nearest to the user's location to cache the information requested by the user. (Inoue: col. 5, ll. 62-64; col. 10: ll. 49-51) However, while requesting a network resource, Inoue's user cannot provide the name of the **vendor**, or the **type**, or the **version** of the user's current device. Inoue's user has no ability to provide the "**vendor/type or version** of the user's current device" while "generating an access request to obtain access to network resource and forwarding the access request for authentication and authorization," as claimed.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### CLAIMS 11, 13, 19 AND 23

Claims 11, 13, 19 and 23 recite features similar to those in claim 1. Therefore, applicants believe that claims 11, 13, 19 and 23 are patentable over Andersen for the same reasons discussed for claim 1.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

#### CLAIMS 24-30

Claims 24-30 recite features similar to those in claims 11, 13 and 23 or depend on claims 11, 13 and 23, except that they are directed to a computer-readable storage medium. Therefore, applicants believe that claims 24-30 are patentable over Andersen for the same reasons discussed for claims 11, 13 and 23.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

#### B. CLAIMS — 35 U.S.C. § 103(e): INOUE, ANDERSON

Claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Inoue in view of Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,089,316 (hereinafter "Anderson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26 depend from claims 1, 11, 13, 19 and 23, respectively. As discussed above, claim 1(11, 13, 19 and 23) recites at least one feature that is not disclosed in Inoue.

Further, Andersen does not cure the deficiencies of Inoue with respect to claim 1(11, 13, 19 and 23) because Andersen does not anticipate “generating an access request by a requesting network access device, through which an end user device can obtain access to network resources, and which is forwarded for authentication and authorization, wherein the requesting network access device description includes one or more of: a requesting network access device vendor, a requesting network access device type and a requesting network access device version,” recited in claim 1.

The Office Action accepted applicants’ arguments, submitted by the applicants in the previous reply, that Andersen does not anticipate the “generating [...]” by withdrawing 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 11, 13, 19 and 23 based on Andersen.

Therefore, due to the above and due to the claim dependency, Inoue and Andersen, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the whole subject matter recited in claims 2-4, 12, 14-16 and 24-26.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

### C. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The claims that are not discussed above depend directly or indirectly on the claims that have been discussed. Therefore, those claims are patentable for the reasons given above. In addition, each of the dependent claims separately introduces features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite positive resolution of the examination, separate arguments are not provided for each of the dependent claims at this time.

### III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A petition for an extension of time is hereby made to the extent necessary to make this reply timely

filed. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any applicable fee to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: January 28, 2009

/Malgorzata A Kulczycka#50496/  
Malgorzata A. Kulczycka  
Reg. No. 50,496

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, California 95110  
Telephone: (408) 414-1228  
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076